

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

GEORGE VIGIL,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 1:20-cv-00740-KG-JFR

JOSEPH AQUINO AND
RIO ARRIBA SHERIFF'S OFFICE,


Defendants.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO WITHDRAW

THIS MATTER having come before the Court upon the Unopposed Motion to Withdraw filed by the Sandoval Firm (Richard A. Sandoval) (Doc. 11), and the Court having reviewed the file and otherwise being fully advised, denies the motion for failure to comply with the requirements of Local Rule 83.8(a) concerning Unopposed Motions to Withdraw.

The motion did not: (1) indicate consent of the client; (2) provide notice of the appointment of a substitute attorney; or (3) provide a statement of the client's intention to appear pro se. *See* D.N.M.LR-Civ. 83.8(a). It appears the motion could be properly filed under Rule 83.8(b)'s "contested" motions to withdraw, permitting a notice and consent period.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion is DENIED without prejudice.



HONORABLE JOHN F. ROBBENHAAR
United States Magistrate Judge